

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 5158. A bill reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 5159. A bill to authorize the payment of premiums on national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance at United States post offices; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 5160. A bill to provide additional compensation for veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5161. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenditures incident to the conservation of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5162. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communications systems; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5163. A bill with respect to the filing of claims of the United States based upon debts of deceased persons; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5164. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to designate the Department of State as the disposal agency for surplus property outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 5165. A bill for the relief of Efsthios Georgas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5166. A bill for the relief of Raphael Elder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. R. 5167. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5168. A bill granting a pension to Oscar O. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 5169. A bill for the relief of Ira Ellis Veal; to the Committee on War Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1461. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of J. H. Raney and 115 others of Mayflower, Ark.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1462. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petition containing the signatures of 157 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, advocating the enactment by the Congress of the original full-employment bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1463. By Mr. LANDIS: Petition of 30,000 war mothers of the United States, pertaining to a bonus for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1464. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 5194 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging reconsideration of action whereby western half of United States was eliminated from consideration as location of permanent site for United Nations Organization; commending Mayor Lapham for his efforts and endorsing his program in connection therewith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1465. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by 71 residents of Macomb County, Mich., expressing interest in H. R. 1648, a bill to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial radio programs by educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1466. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Association of Women Lawyers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 4502; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1467. Also, petition of the Philadelphia County Council of American Veterans of World War II, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to veteran representation on investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

1468. Also, petition of the Philippine-Hawaii-America Labor Union, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for intervention by the High Commissioner to the Philippines against the proclamation of President Osmeña to hold election for national elective officials only; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1946

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this still moment, make us vividly aware of Thy divine invasion through all the areas of our yearning lives; give us the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation.

May the poisoning evils which blight the earth not devastate our inner lives, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy. Clothed in the undefiled garments of love's pure vestment, may we walk with Thee in white as in the spirit of the Master we face the infinite pathos of the troubled world we fain would serve before we fall on sleep. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

ALBERT W. HAWKES, a Senator from the State of New Jersey; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming; and CLAUDE PEPPER, a Senator from the State of Florida, appeared in their seats today.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Morse
Andrews	Gossett	Murray
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Buck	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Walsh
Downey	McKellar	Wherry
Eastland	McMahon	White
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Willis
Fulbright	Mead	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business as a member of the Mead committee.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is unavoidably absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be approved without reading.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall

object—I wish to state to the Chair that I have had occasion to examine the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, and I desire to move to amend the Journal; and I wish to have it read in full. I should like to be recognized to offer the amendment as soon as the Journal has been read, but I object to dispensing with the reading of the Journal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the Journal.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 17, 1946.

During the reading of the Journal:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the further reading of the Journal be suspended.

Mr. OVERTON. I object. Such action can only be had by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not in order under the rule. The clerk will proceed with the reading of the Journal.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, does that conclude the reading of the Journal?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the reading of the Journal.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Morse
Andrews	Gossett	Murray
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Buck	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Walsh
Downey	McKellar	Wherry
Eastland	McMahon	White
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Willis
Fulbright	Mead	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The motion was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

I move to amend the Journal of the Senate for Thursday, January 17, 1946, so as to include therein in full the prayer delivered by the Chaplain of the Senate at the convening of the Senate on said day, and that the Journal clerk be instructed to incorporate such prayer in the Journal of the proceedings at the proper place.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, during the 13 years that I have been a Member of the United States Senate I have no recollection of the Journal having been read on more than one occasion prior to this day. I believe that the Journal should be read more frequently than it is. I do not intend to insist that it be read every day. However, I noticed that there was a larger attendance of Members of the Senate during the reading of the Journal than there has been in many a day in this body.

I hope that that shows the interest which Members of the Senate take in the official record of the proceedings of this great body. It furnishes not only to the Senate and to Senators who could not be constantly in attendance throughout the proceedings of yesterday information as to what took place, but it is a record which shows to the public generally exactly what their elected representatives are doing in the United States Senate. This is a democracy, and we should be perfectly willing at all times to show to the public exactly what we have done and what our proceedings are, in order that the people may be kept informed.

There is another reason why I think the Journal should be read. It is a permanent record. It is true that we have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is more or less ephemeral, and is for temporary use. The Journal is the permanent record of the proceedings of the United States Senate. It is presumed that it will remain forever and a day, as long as this Nation survives, in the archives of this great Nation as a record of the proceedings of the United States Senate from day to day.

It is recognized not only as the permanent record, but as the record. For example, if there is any discrepancy between the report of the proceedings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the report of the proceedings as contained in the Journal, the Journal has predominance; the Journal governs.

We are very fortunate, indeed, Mr. President, in having extremely able and accurate reporters, who set forth in greater detail, it is true, than does the Journal, the proceedings of the United States Senate, and set forth all that has been done, all the speeches, and every word uttered on the floor of the Senate, in a marvelously accurate manner, indeed with an accuracy which seems to me almost humanly impossible. It matters not how low may be the voice of a Senator on the floor; it matters not how long he may talk; it matters not what may be his diction, whether it be in the ordinary language of the street or whether it be classical in form, whether it be a plain statement or whether it be adorned with quotations from foreign languages, the official reporters of the Senate take down accurately what a Senator has to say upon the floor of the Senate. I rarely take the trouble to look over my remarks and make corrections, or see whether any error has been committed; and I must say that on the occasions when I have

looked over the RECORD it has been rare indeed that I have found an error. If I considered it an error, the probability was that I was taken down accurately and that it was my memory and not the pen of the reporter which was at fault. I think it is proper that I should pay this deserved tribute to the official reporters of debates of the Senate.

However, Mr. President, I come back to my original theme, and that is that the Journal of the Senate is the official record, which is transcendental and dominates any other record which may be made of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Journal transmits to future generations what has happened in the Senate on a particular day. Does not the Senator think that by all means future generations should know that sessions of the Senate are opened with prayer, and that we are a godly and Christian body?

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed, Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the able Senator from Mississippi; so much so that I have just now offered a motion to the effect that the official Journal of the Senate shall show not only that prayer was offered, but shall embody the prayer in full. To that motion I shall presently address myself.

But, sir, when we take the time, as we should, to have read to us the official record of the Journal, there is a possibility that we may discover what to us, at least, may appear to be some error in the record.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has very eloquently spoken of the excellent work done by the official reporters, and I wonder whether the Senator also intends to speak of the excellent work done by the printers and those who serve in connection with the printing of the RECORD in which so few, if any, errors ever occur.

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed, I do; and I shall be glad to do so at once. I was going to speak of the work done by some of the other officers connected with transcribing and reporting what the Senate has done, but I shall be very glad to say that I think we have a public printing establishment that is unsurpassed in all the world. As the able Senator from South Carolina has stated, it is not only a very accurate RECORD, but it is gotten out with amazing rapidity. We may have sessions lasting until late in the afternoon, we may have sessions which extend after the shadows of evening have fallen, we may have sessions which are prolonged beyond the dinner hour, we may have sessions which last until midnight, but the next morning there is left at the door of our homes and also at our offices a complete and accurate record of all which has been said and done in this body.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?



Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree entirely with the Senator in regard to the rapidity with which the RECORD is gotten out. Does not the Senator think that it is marvelous that here is a document containing the wisdom of the age that is gotten out daily with great speed and practically without error? Is it not a marvelous example of the skill of modern printing? Does the Senator agree with me in that statement?

Mr. OVERTON. I do most certainly agree with the statement which the Senator from Mississippi has just made.

But now, Mr. President, let me state that in offering the motion to amend the Journal I do not wish to be understood as in any way reflecting upon our able and faithful and skillful Journal clerk. I do not wish to appear or to have the motion interpreted as being in any way critical of the work he does. He has been here for a number of years, and he commands the respect and the confidence of all Members of the Senate. I do not think there is a Senator here now or any Senator who has ever served while our present Journal clerk was sitting at the desk who would for a moment undertake to criticize him in any manner whatsoever. The motion which I have made, Mr. President, is not intended as a criticism. It is intended as a conception on my part of what should be recorded in the Journal—something which, according to the Journal clerk, perhaps should not be recorded there. It may be that on yesterday the Journal clerk failed to insert in the Journal the prayer delivered by our Chaplain. It may be that in the past he has been inserting daily the prayers delivered here by our Chaplain. I am not in a position to know that of my own personal knowledge. I am not in that position because unfortunately, as I have stated, the Journal of our proceedings is rarely read; in fact, according to my recollection, only once has the Journal been read to the Senate during the number of years I have had the honor to serve in this body. So I do not know whether it has been the custom or not the custom, and probably there is not a Senator who is within the sound of my voice who knows now whether the prayer delivered here by our Chaplain usually is incorporated in the Journal. But I wish to say that I do not believe—in fact, I refuse to believe—that there is a single Senator who would object to having the prayer of the Chaplain inserted in the permanent Journal of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. President, we have a very able Chaplain, who commands our respect, our esteem, and our warmest affection. It would be hard to conceive that the prayers which are delivered before the United States Senate by our Chaplain could be excelled by those of any other minister of the Gospel. They are terse; they are to the point; they are imbued with the inspiration born of a righteous life and long familiarity with the Holy Scriptures. I have listened many a time with bowed head to the prayers which have been uttered by our Chaplain upon the floor of the Senate, and certainly I

have not in my heart found any occasion to object to any thought he has uttered.

For instance, let us consider the very prayer delivered yesterday, which I think should be incorporated in the Journal. Let me read it to the Senate:

Father of all mercies, in a dark and desperate hour we turn to Thee with deep needs that only Thou canst meet. Everywhere in a violent world we hear voices that challenge all that men have counted fixed, final, and sure. In this day of crashing systems, save us from being prophets of gloom and of doom. Through the fiery destruction of the old, may there be vouchsafed to us vistas of a richer and fairer earth to be. Forbid that we should be so blind today that tomorrow all we now labor for prove like stubble to a devouring flame—the foundations we now choose be revealed as but sinking sand. Scorning the cheap cant of secular panaceas, give us to see that we cannot house our spirits even in ornate barns—that really to live we must build more stately mansions for our souls. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

Mr. President, the diction of that prayer is beautiful; it is classical. But that is not what I am thinking about, and it is not what motivated me in making my motion.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to propound to the Senator a question. During the reading of the Chaplain's prayer the Senator read the words "In this day of crashing systems." Does the Senator believe that the Chaplain spoke with prophetic vision, and that he was speaking of the onslaught against American institutions by the Communist movement of this country, and in particular by a bill called a bill to create a permanent FEPC, which was before the Senate yesterday?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, much as I admire my able friend from Mississippi, I shall not for a moment believe that our Chaplain had any political motives in mind when he delivered his prayer. I do not believe that he was taking in any way a partisan view of any legislation. Of course, I have no doubt that as a citizen he has his own views.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that the ministers of this country should take an active interest in repelling communism, inasmuch as communism is an enemy of the Christian church?

Mr. OVERTON. I am not in disagreement with that thought. I really entertain the view that the Chaplain of the United States Senate, the Senate being composed of Members of widely varying views, should refrain, as does the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, our present Chaplain, from uttering any prayer which might be interpreted as being political or partisan in character. When I say "political" I mean in the sense of a party allegiance. When I say "partisan" I refer to partisan differences which may exist in our political world.

What motivated me in making the motion which I have made was this: As I have already said, the Journal is the permanent record of the proceedings of the United States Senate. Suppose that

in years to come our children's children should be looking back to see what took place in this body; suppose that it should appear to them, according to the Journal, that while it was true that prayer was offered, yet so little consideration was given to it that only bare mention of the fact of its having been uttered was incorporated in the official Journal of our proceedings. Let us also consider the fact that the reference to the prayer does not indicate what were the views of the Chaplain, or what was the character of the prayer which he uttered. In ages yet unborn, when the historian will be looking back upon the events of this year and upon the proceedings of this body, and when perhaps all other records of any great importance shall have been destroyed, and the official Journal of the proceedings of the Senate is still found to be in existence, will that historian be in a position to know whether or not our Chaplain was addressing the people who are the representatives of a Christian nation?

Mr. President, we are a Christian nation. The overwhelming majority of the people of the United States are Christians. I care not whether all of them be Christians, whether there are those who do not recognize the divinity of our Lord Jesus but do recognize the existence of a Christian God. I refer to our friends of the Hebrew race. The Jews of this country, most of whom have adhered to the faith of their fathers, do not recognize what to us is a beautiful and spiritual consummation of the Old Testament and its traditions. There is nothing in all literature more beautiful and more inspiring than the pilgrimage of the lowly Nazarene on this earth, the sermons which he delivered, the thoughts which he uttered, and the parables which he spoke. They are transcendently beautiful. His whole life was amazingly wonderful. It was not only sublime and not only divine, but as became the Son of God, it was spiritually uplifting.

Mr. President, I recall reading years ago, when I was a boy, the story of the Blind Preacher, written, as I remember, by William Wirt. Mr. Wirt was traveling through the country one Sunday morning and as he wended his way on horseback along the wooded road through the shadows and the sunshine of a beautiful summer day, he came to a little church on the hillside. It was about the time for church services. He entered the church, which was of a rustic character, with benches bare and hard. But there sat on those benches pious persons who were there for the purpose of revering their God and listening to the words of spiritual advice to be delivered to them by their minister. The minister rose and Mr. Wirt found very much to his surprise, that he was blind. But he proceeded to talk about Jesus, and as he pursued his theme he developed the beauty and glory and grandeur and divinity of the mission of Christ on earth.

Finally, when he came to the death of our Lord on Calvary, to the crucifixion, he rose to transcendent heights of eloquence. Tears were streaming from the

eyes of Mr. Wirt and all the other listeners in that little church when the blind minister concluded his description. The narrator stated that he did not know how the minister could possibly have ascended to such heights of eloquence.

The blind speaker stood there silently some 20 or 30 seconds. Then he raised his sightless eyes to Heaven and, with uplifted arms, said "Socrates died like a philosopher; Jesus Christ died like a God."

I do not know that I have read anything more eloquently descriptive of the pilgrimage on earth of our Lord and Savior than that story which I read years and years ago.

Mr. President, there is no reason why in this God-fearing Christian nation we should not incorporate in the Journal of our proceedings the prayers delivered at the opening of the sessions of the Senate. Motions made by Senators are put in the Journal with meticulous care; messages from the House are inserted and, if not set forth literally, at least their purport is embodied in the Journal. Bills introduced are referred to, and a description of them is given. A Senator sitting beside me suggests that editorials, perhaps, are included. However, they do not appear in the Journal; as a rule they are published in the Appendix of the RECORD unless they are read on the floor of the Senate by a Senator, when they become incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Journal goes into this minutiae about matters which after all are at least not more important than the fact that we are here as the representatives of a Christian nation in a Christian era, still followers of Him who made the greatest sacrifice in all the history of the world for us and for all humanity; and yet there is withheld from the permanent record of the proceedings of the Senate the voice that is raised in recognition of the divinity of our Saviour and the omnipotence of our God.

Mr. President, I do not conceive that there can be any Senator to whose attention this omission is called who would not agree with what I have said and would not support the motion which I make to amend the permanent record of our proceedings.

The prayer is not in the Journal, Mr. President. I want it there. The prayer delivered yesterday was a prayer to which every one of us and everyone in this Nation I think, be he Jew or gentile, so long as he is an American, can subscribe.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to interrupt the remarks or the thought of the eloquent Senator from Louisiana but I wonder if he would bear with me for about a half a minute to make an observation, without taking him off the floor?

Mr. OVERTON. I have to have unanimous consent; and, therefore, I do not yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Louisiana yielding to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed I do; I am very happy to do so.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before I state the question I should like to make a bit of background so that the Senator will comprehend the question I am about to ask.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am not yielding the floor, and I hope the Senator will so phrase what he has to say in the form of an interrogatory as not to raise that issue, because I am yielding only for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland does not wish to do any injustice to his colleague from Louisiana, and therefore he will frame in the form of a question what he would prefer to say outright. I ask the Senator from Louisiana—and request that he withhold his answer until I conclude my question—I ask the Senator from Louisiana if he is not and if all other Senators are not familiar with the fact that the economic life of this Nation at this time lies prostrate; that hundreds of thousands and perhaps millions of men are now out on strike, and that the soldiers who are coming home from the wars, purportedly coming home to peace and to an opportunity to take their place in the affairs of our country, are finding their hopes set at naught? I ask the Senator if he knows these things, and I ask other Senators if they do not know from past history that it is probable that action on a certain measure either now before or shortly to come before the Senate is not possible in the immediate future under the rules and the practice of the Senate and the expressed and proven opposition to the measure on former occasions, and already present here? I would say in answer to my question—

Mr. OVERTON. Understand, Mr. President, I am yielding only for a question—

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And I hope the Presiding Officer will protect me in my rights.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator if he does not see that in making this interrogatory I am not taking sides on the issue itself which is more or less under debate here? I ask the Senator if it is not apparent to all concerned that there can be no immediate action in all probability on this matter at this time? I ask the Senator from Louisiana if it is not a fact that while this measure is pending before the Senate all hope of congressional action dealing with labor-management disputes and the chaos which reaches from one end of the country to the other is impossible? I ask the Senator if it is not the hope and the wish and the desire of the millions of people who make up this Republic that we proceed to that which is the over-all important issue before our people at this time. I ask the Senator, therefore, if he would not be willing temporarily to lay this bill aside so that the Senate of the United States could take up something upon

which it could legislate, and I ask him if the time has not come for us to take action in view of the unrest now prevailing, and to make such contribution as the Congress of the United States can make to bring about tranquillity in the social order?

I ask the Senator again to consider whether in making this appeal he does not see that I am not taking any side, pro or con, on the merits of the question itself, but that I am asking only if he does not believe that the big question which should be considered by us now is appropriate legislation which may in some measure at least allay the unrest and the strife which exist in the field of labor and management? I pause for an answer to my first question. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Maryland not only makes an eloquent statement but he makes a very clear statement, in the form, of course, in the present instance, of an interrogatory addressed to me.

There is no one, not only in this body but within the range of my acquaintance, for whose lucidity of expression and whose ability to present any problem, graphically, convincingly, and clearly, I have a greater regard than I have for those distinguishing attributes of the Senator from Maryland. I regard him as the Thomas Babington Macaulay of the United States Senate. We know that in all literature no writer is clearer than Macaulay, and no one whose essays are more interesting.

I recall that when Macaulay came to write the History of England, he made the statement that he was going to write a history which would take the place of the last novel in every lady's boudoir, and he did it. When I picked up the History of England, written by Lord Macaulay, I scarcely let it drop, except to get a few hours' sleep, until I had completed it. That may be a slight exaggeration, and I always try to be as accurate as possible in my remarks.

I was about to say the Senator from Maryland is almost always right. I think I may still make that statement. He is unquestionably right in the multitude of interrogatories he has propounded to me, all of which are but a rephrasing and a clearer statement of the fundamental issue which now presents itself, not only to this body, but to the people of the United States.

Are we, who should be concerning ourselves with legislation now critically needed for the benefit of the Nation, to stop our ears to the startling problems to which the Senator from Maryland refers? Have we so forsaken our duty, have we become so indifferent to our responsibilities as United States Senators, representatives of the people of this great country, that we turn a deaf ear to the unrest prevailing here, and the great problems to which the Senator has alluded? Are we going to throw aside and decline to consider the questions now involving management and labor in order to take up a bill which undertakes to do the things this bill does?

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield for a question?



Mr. OVERTON. I have not quite answered the Senator's question, but I very gladly yield to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I wanted to ask him if he was not familiar with the fact that the Senator from Maryland who is propounding these interrogatories himself voted to take up the measure now pending when the question was voted upon yesterday. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in view of that circumstance, if the bill shall be laid aside, the questions I am propounding could be considered as an attack upon the merits of the pending proposition itself.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, and when I heard his voice answer "Yea," from the very seat from which I am now speaking, I exclaimed as did Caesar in the Capitol at Rome, "Et tu, Brute," [laughter] because the Senator comes from a State resplendent in its magnificent history, great in its statesmanship, a State which very largely sympathized with the white democracies of the South, a State a large majority of whose people to this day adhere to the ideals of a section of our country that is rich in its storied ideals. So, though I have no desire to criticize the Senator, I must say that it was with keen disappointment that I heard him vote "Yea," and I said to him, jestingly, when he did, "Alas, MILLARD, has Maryland seceded from the Confederacy?" [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Having established my good faith in the interrogatory I propounded to the Senator, and believing that the right of consideration is one of the fundamental rights, I so voted, but I hasten to ask, does the Senator from Louisiana, or does any other Senator, so far as he knows, consider that it would be possible to dispose of the measure now pending, even though it should be debated for the next 30 days?

Mr. OVERTON. The answer is "No." My very good friend, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], for whom I entertain a very warm affection, stated yesterday, in his presentation of the pending measure, that it could be disposed of in a few hours. It presents, so far as my section of the country, at least, is concerned, too fundamental an issue to be disposed of in a few hours.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. We would be unworthy of representing the great States we do represent did we not seek the opportunity at least to express our views, and to present to the Senate and to the people of the United States the hopes and aspirations of our people. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it was with the intention of propounding a question to the able Senator that I rose. I fully agree, if he will permit me just a moment, with everything the Senator has said.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I must—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not trying to take the Senator off his feet. I agree that all legislation should be fully debated, whether it be the legislation now proposed or other measures.

Let me, however, ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that yesterday the Senate of the United States, by a vote of 49 to 17, voted to take up this bill?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Now, if I may ask another question, let me say that I desire to go along with the Senator in the effort to enact legislation; but if the pending bill were now to be displaced, can the Senator tell us on what other particular bill the Senate of the United States could vote this afternoon?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I am not a member of the steering committee of the United States Senate. The majority leader is not in his seat. I am not in a position to answer the Senator. I could, however, refer to some of the bills which are upon the calendar. I would have to glance over the titles of the bills as I go through the calendar and determine casually whether the bills are important or not.

The first bill on the calendar is a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. Of course the Interstate Commerce Commission is a very important body, and it has vast powers. I have not had an opportunity as yet to read this bill. Probably the Senator from New Mexico has not had the opportunity to read it. I do not know how far-reaching the bill is. It may be a very important bill and one which it is necessary to take up for early passage.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if it is not a fact that to the very first bill on the calendar to which the Senator referred, amendments could be offered which would deal with the strike situation, the labor-management situation, which would be in order, and which could become the law of the land if the Senate of the United States were to adopt them and the House were subsequently to agree to them.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator from Maryland is correct. We are not going to satisfy our constituents by saying to them that here we are in the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, with legislation coming over from the previous session, and we are not in a position to act on anything except on one bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. EASTLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, and then to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I contend that every bill on the Senate Calendar should be acted upon, but it happens that at this particular moment Senate bill 101, by the voice of the Senate, by the action

of the Senate, is the pending and unfinished business. Why can we not dispose of it one way or the other? I am not speaking of the merits of the bill. But I should like to have action on the measure, and I ask the Senator whether he does not think that the bill should be voted down or voted up, one way or the other, after adequate and ample debate?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator might just as well ask me whether I do not think it ought to be voted up, because I think the Senator knows, as I know, that if the bill were put to a vote at the present time by the Senate it would be passed. But it is not going to be passed until we have an opportunity of saying what we want to say. I do not think it is important that action be had upon a bill which creates a commission in a Government which now reeks with bureaucracy, a bill which would create a commission which would be discriminatory in its very constitution, a bill which would create a commission the fundamental purpose and the scarcely concealed purpose of which is once more to grind the heel into the face of our southland.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator know that there are hundreds of thousands of American soldiers in Asia, on the islands of the Pacific, and in Europe, who want to come home?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. The Senator is correct. That is true.

Mr. EASTLAND. And does not the Senator know that today there are hundreds of thousands of mothers in America who yearn for their boys to come home? Does not the Senator think that the taking up of this bill, which would create an FEPC, has locked the wheels and prevented the Senate from considering legislation to bring those men back to their families in America?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is absolutely correct. My correspondence demonstrates the truth of his statement. The majority of the letters which come to me from mothers and fathers and wives and even children of men overseas are letters which beg of me to do something to bring the soldier boys back home.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. EASTLAND addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. OVERTON. No, Mr. President, I do not yield now. I desire first to answer the question. Those requests reach into the very profoundest depths of my sympathy. Yet nothing can be done about that matter except to continue the investigation now being conducted by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. We leave it to the War Department. We leave it to the Navy Department. Perhaps that is right. But, heavens above, what the fathers and mothers and wives and children of the men in service overseas want is consideration of a measure which would give an opportunity on the part of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives to declare themselves one way or the other on a question which is much

more vital to them than whether or not Mr. A, conducting a grocery store in the city of Alexandria, my adopted home, shall employ a buck Negro instead of a white man to assist him in operating the store.

Numerous other questions, such as the labor-management controversy, confront the country. I shall not go into the question of who is right or who is wrong in the labor-management dispute, but here are laborers who think they have been so wronged that they have quit their work, they have walked out of the factories, thousands and hundreds of thousands of them, and I dare say they want some consideration. And here is management which finds its business closed, going into the red, because labor refuses to work for it. Yet, Mr. President, we sit idle. We either do not have the purpose, or we do not have something else necessary to meet such a situation.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to announce my stand on the labor-management question. I am willing to take a stand on the question of the return of our soldier boys from overseas. I am willing to take a stand on the bill now before the Senate. But it is idle for the Senator from New Mexico to say to me that the only business to which this body can direct its attention is this FEPC piece of legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if he does not appreciate the further fact that since this bill has come before the Senate, and since we have met today, the offer of settlement made in the steel strike by the President of the United States has, as I notice by a late bulletin, been rejected, thus further aggravating the situation existing in this country?

Mr. OVERTON. That is the information I have received, Mr. President. It is a matter that should gravely concern us. The industry of our Nation is largely in peril. Reconversion is in peril. Production of goods necessary for our livelihood is in peril. The agitation may go further. The situation deserves our earnest consideration. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to meet the question at any time. Since I have been diverted from my subject, through no fault of my own, I shall offer a solution, which probably few Senators will agree to, respecting the management-labor question. I had intended to adhere to my text, which was my motion to amend the Journal, but I am perfectly willing to offer a solution which I think would be adequate. I am not in favor of creating commissions, and I do not know that the creation of an additional permanent commission would be involved in the suggestion I am about to make, but I should like to see a commission appointed—call it a commission of arbitration, or call it what you will—which would be armed with the authority to decide all controversies in major disputes between management and labor. I think that such a commission ought to be composed of, say, one-fourth management, one-fourth labor, and one-half members represent-

ing the general public, because, after all, John Q. Public has the greatest interest in these disputes. I do not suggest an arbitrary equation, but at least one-half the membership should represent the public, because the public is the principal sufferer from strikes and disputes between management and labor.

The decision of such a tribunal should be final and binding on both management and labor. When Bill Jones and Henry Brown, both good, stanch, loyal American citizens, have a dispute which they cannot settle amicably, they are required to go into court and submit their cause to the decision of the judiciary, and the decision of the court is binding upon them. There can be no violence. There can be no picketing. There can be no lock-outs. There can be no shut-downs. They must submit to the orderly processes of justice. If, Mr. President, you and I and all other American citizens, in the disputes which may exist between us individually, are required to go before a tribunal constituted for the purpose, and submit our controversies in a peaceful and orderly manner, why should we hesitate to require capital and labor to pursue the same course? As a nation we are willing to submit our disputes with other nations to an international tribunal. Is union labor greater than the United States of America? Is the management of great industry more to be considered than the United States of America, our country, and our Nation?

Yet, if I were to introduce a bill undertaking to carry out the proposal which I have set forth in bold outline, I dare say that very few Senators would vote for it. When I make that statement, I do not intend to criticize Members of the Senate, because I suppose it is very proper that they should represent their constituents. It is well for those who come from States where labor unions predominate, or at least where they poll votes which are decisive, to consider the attitude of labor. There are those who are not particularly interested in the problems of labor, as contradistinguished from the problems of management, and are more inclined to sympathize with management.

I believe that management would be against such a bill. Why should both labor and management refuse to submit their controversies to a tribunal for final decision in an orderly, quiet, and peaceful manner? It is a reflection upon our Government. It is because they are afraid of what would be the composition of such a tribunal. Management is afraid that it might be dominated by those who favor labor, and labor is afraid that it might be dominated by those who favor management. Yet, Mr. President, we must trust someone. The people of the United States trust you and me and Members of the House to enact legislation for them and in their behalf, on the most vital issues which concern them. But when it comes to the creation of a commission, the membership of which would be appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the United States Senate, management and labor are both afraid of what the President might do and what the United States Senate might do.

I branched off on this question, Mr. President, because there is no reason why I should not be willing to offer a solution. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico has stated that there is nothing to be done about management and labor because there is no bill before the United States Senate. Therefore I am offering to him my concept of a bill which I believe would do the work.

At any rate, Mr. President, it is no answer to the American people that we sit here idle and refuse to meet the issue. It may be that these strikes, disputes, and controversies will fall of their own weight. It may be that they will not, and that we shall be going from bad to worse. In any event, the issue is at our door and we ought to be able to meet it. So I say to the Senator from New Mexico, who I regret to say has stepped out of the Chamber momentarily, that there is one Senator who is perfectly willing to meet the issue at any time that the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle is willing to give him an opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I did not intend to enter into a discussion of this question, and I do not intend to discuss the bill which is now pending before the Senate. I was speaking about the propriety of incorporating into the permanent record of the Senate the prayer of a man of God in opening our solemn deliberations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has ably stated his views and position as to what the Congress of the United States should do, or what he would do in connection with the terrible crisis which our country faces, involving management and labor, returning veterans, and so forth. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not his opinion that legislation such as is proposed in the so-called FEPC bill could be enacted by the States themselves which desire to do so? For example, several years ago New York State enacted such legislation. If it is so important to certain States in the Union, whose legislatures are either now in session or soon to be in session, why should not the States themselves legislate on this subject, and leave to the National Legislature the national legislation which is necessary at this time? I should like to have the Senator comment on that question if he will.

Mr. OVERTON. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. New York did meet the problem. Its legislature enacted legislation to cover the situation. Illinois has done the same thing. One other State has done likewise. Those States have met the issue as it should be met, because they respond to the views and sentiments of their people. But when we in far-off Washington undertake to say to the people of California just what they shall do in reference to the employment of labor, or whom they shall employ, and to say to the people of Louisiana that the Federal Government will step into little business or big business and require it to conform to an act of Congress, whether or not its provisions meet the necessities and problems of the particular locality



and the views of the people, I believe that that is a mistaken conception of what the National Congress should do.

A great deal of legislation which is enacted by the Federal Congress on a national basis could be enacted locally. There has been a gradual infringement of the Federal power upon State sovereignty. The Congress of the United States—and in this respect I am one who in a measure is to blame—have forgotten what are State rights, and have undertaken to regulate by national legislation what should be regulated locally.

Mr. President, I wish to revert to the theme upon which I commenced. Since no prayer is to be found in the Journal, I should like to read a few phrases from the Bible. I wish to read some verses from the Book of Revelations, and I now read from the sixteenth chapter of Revelations:

And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth.

And the first went, and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast, and upon them which worshiped his image.

And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea.

Mr. President, I have been reading a prophecy. It is a prophecy contained in the Book of Revelations, and in very large measure it applies, I think, to recent events not only in the life of this Nation but throughout the world.

I continue reading:

And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood.

And I heard the angel of the waters say, Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because Thou has judged thus.

For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy.

And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments.

And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire.

And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give Him glory.

And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain.

And blasphemed the God of Heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds.

And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.

And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet.

For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.

Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.

And he gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon.

And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done.

And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great.

And the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.

And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found.

And there fell upon men a great hail out of Heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great.

Mr. President, that chapter in Revelations pictures the gradual growth of modern warfare, and the continually increasing destruction wrought by modern weapons, until we reach the atomic era, which has now come upon us, and which represents the greatest destruction of all, where, in the language of the Holy Writ, there are—

voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and \* \* \* a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great—

And, Mr. President, the destruction of human life and the burning of humanity, with the intense glare and heat.

I do not know whether we have reached Armageddon, but it is possible that we are moving rapidly toward it. I know that we are doing what we can to bring peace on earth and to have the rule of the Prince of Peace among the nations of the world. I hope we shall be successful. I do not know. But in further answer to what the Senator from New Mexico has said in criticism of my humble effort here today, let me say that certainly there is presented in the present international situation a far greater problem than is presented by this bill which undertakes to prevent religious discrimination and undertakes to say to the Baptists, "You cannot employ so many Baptists in your business and in your industry. You must have Jews and Catholics and Methodists and Presbyterians and Episcopalians"—at least, Mr. President, such authority is given by the bill.

In further answer to the issue which has been raised by the Senator from New Mexico, and in answer to the question which he propounded to me, I should like to read several provisions of the bill which go to the very heart of the bill itself. Under the title "Unfair Employment Practices Defined" I read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

An employer is defined to mean any employer who has in his employ six or more persons.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it the Senator's construction of the bill that if an employer does not employ a fair and reasonable percentage of Jews, of Catholics, of Gentiles, or of Christians, the presumption must prevail that he is discriminating against them?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And is it the Senator's understanding that the bill would require the employer to apportion his employees not only in accordance with races, such as white and black, but in accordance with religion? Is that a proper construction of the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. It is a proper construction of the bill.

Mr. President, I shall read hurriedly some of the provisions of the bill:

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

An employer may not refuse to employ, and may not discharge any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

I continue reading:

(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of persons for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against persons because of their race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. President, let us consider those four provisions of the bill. Several of my very good friends, who are very able businessmen, belong to the Roman Catholic Church. They are good citizens and they are respected. So far as I know, no one criticizes them because they happen to belong to a church which is different from the church to which I belong. It happens that one of them is a very devout member of the Catholic Church and he is necessarily thrown into intercourse and friendly association with more members of his denomination than he is with those of any Protestant denomination.

The result is that there naturally is in his store a predominant number of employees of the Roman Catholic faith. They are good employees, and they do their work efficiently. But under the pending bill a representative of the FEPC could walk into that store and say, "Well, there is a Baptist who is prepared to work in your store, and at this time you are employing a Roman Catholic. The Baptist is just as good as the Roman Catholic. Why did you employ the Roman Catholic?"

The employer would perhaps reply, "Because I know him and he is a friend of mine. I did not know much about the other man. He is practically a stranger to me."

The FEPC representative could reply, "Yes, but I have looked over the personnel of your store and I find there is in it a predominance of Roman Catholics, and that is discrimination. What you should have done was to employ the Baptist and not the Catholic."

I have some very good Jewish friends—a number of whom are operating department stores and engaged in other lines of business. An overwhelming majority of their employees are of the Jewish race and of the Jewish faith. That is natural, is it not? Those employers are thrown into more intimate intercourse with members of the Jewish faith than they are with members of other denominations. And if that is not an adequate reason, why may not an employer employ whom he pleases if he believes that such person can efficiently perform his duties? Why should a representative of the Federal Government step into that man's business and say, "You are overloaded with employees of the Jewish faith and you must get rid of them and employ persons of the Protestant faith. There must be an absence of such disproportion in the racial background and the religious views of your employees."

Mr. President, this bill would arm the Federal agency with the authority to do what I have described. I have read the bill, and I am not mistaken in my understanding of it. If the law is to be obeyed Jewish managers of stores may not employ friends of theirs even if, in their opinion, such friends are capable of performing the work which will be required of them, but must employ an Episcopalian, a Baptist, a Methodist, or a Holy Roller who is better qualified, in the opinion of the FEPC or any other Federal authority which has a right to pass upon the qualifications of employees. I do not believe that fact is generally understood throughout the country.

I venture the assertion, Mr. President, that numbers of employers in large establishments in cities such as San Francisco, Omaha, New Orleans, and New York, if they understood the full purport and effect of the proposed legislation and the power that would be vested in a central authority to regulate employment in their establishments, would be pouring in letters and telegrams against the enactment of the measure.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to private employers. Has the Senator given any thought as to how the measure would affect civil-service employees?

Mr. OVERTON. There is a provision with reference to Federal employees, which appears at the top of page 2, where it is provided:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination—

That is, discrimination on account of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry—

in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

So the bill applies to all employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is not a question of eliminating discrimination. The bill gives a Government bureau permission to tell the representatives of the Federal Government, in the last analysis, who shall or who shall not be taken from the civil service rolls in accordance with legal authority. Is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct. I should like to ask the author of the bill, the Senator from New Mexico, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assure the Senator that any question he might ask would not in any way jeopardize his right to continue to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none.

Mr. OVERTON. Would the provision I have read apply to the clerical staffs in senatorial and congressional offices?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator that those who are sponsoring the bill, those who believe in the philosophy of the bill, do not contend that the bill provides that in a Senator's office, or in a factory, or in a shop, or in a grocery store, the owner or the management of the place is obligated to hire anyone. The only thing the bill provides for is that people shall not be discriminated against, that they shall not be disqualified, on account of race or creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall address an argument ad hominem. Instead of addressing the question to the Senator from New Mexico, I shall address it to myself. I have a senatorial office in which I have more than six employees. We will say a colored woman, who is thoroughly well educated, a graduate of several universities, thoroughly well qualified, walks into my office, where I have a vacancy, and desires employment, and I refuse to give it to her. Then, do I not violate this provision? The bill reads, "to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry." I would have to tell an infamous story about it and say I refused to employ her for some other reason, but my reason for refusing to employ her would be on account of her color—her race.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My opinion is that the Senator would not be bothered whatsoever by the proposed law.

Mr. OVERTON. Then what is the effect of the law? If it does not apply to me, if we Senators are exempting ourselves, are we not also exempting all other businesses of the Nation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is posing a hypothetical question.

Mr. OVERTON. No; I am posing a concrete question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator does not have to hire a Jew if he does not like a Jew.

Mr. OVERTON. Even if I do not like a Jew—and I have no antipathy toward Jews—I cannot refuse to hire a Jew. That is the very language of the bill. Listen to it:

It shall be an unfair-employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

That is, any employer, Federal or private, employing six or more persons.

(1) To refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Very well. Suppose I did have an antipathy to a Jew, or suppose I were a Protestant who had an antipathy to a Roman Catholic, and a Jew or a Catholic should walk into my office thoroughly well qualified, perhaps much abler than any employee in my senatorial office, and I should turn the applicant down and select someone less qualified. Why would I do it? I would do it on account of some antipathy to the applicant by reason of his faith or race or color or creed.

The same applies to the Negro. It cannot be said, according to the provisions of this bill, that one can make a discrimination between Mr. Negro and Mr. Jew and Mr. Protestant. So that a Negress can walk into my office, where I have white young ladies from the South in my employ, and the Federal Government can say to me I have to employ her and put her side by side with the other young ladies in my office.

Mr. President, I am a loyal, law-abiding citizen, but I do not know what I would do, under those circumstances, to any FEPC agent, be he black or white, who would walk into my office and make such a demand as that. If I feel like that about it, how do the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from North Carolina, and the Senator from California, feel about it? How do my friends down in Louisiana, who are conducting their own business, who have white laborers working side by side in large stores and small shops, and do not want Negroes, regard this bill? How is it to be enforced against them? It will be enforced at the point of the bayonet. That is the only way the Federal Government will be able to enforce it.

Mr. President, the bill is totally, radically, irretrievably, wrong. When we make personal application of it to our own offices, it is wrong.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has given a very good description and statement as to how the bill would affect Government employees, such as those in our own offices. I wonder whether before the Senator concludes his very able address he would care to make a suggestion as to how it would affect the unions, for instance, the railroad trainmen, conductors, flagmen, switchmen, and so forth and so on.

Mr. OVERTON. There is another provision of the bill which declares:

It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

(1) To deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

So they have to take them all in.



(2) To expel from membership any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I think I have proceeded as far as I can proceed this afternoon, and I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to suggest, Mr. President, that the Senator from Louisiana has been making a very able and impressive argument to any man with an open mind, it makes no difference on which side of the subject he may be. I think we should have a quorum present whether he proceeds or not, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Morse
Andrews	Gossett	Murray
Austin	Green	O'Daniel
Bailey	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Pepper
Barkley	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hayden	Revercomb
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Buck	Huffman	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stanfill
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Walsh
Downey	McKellar	Wherry
Eastland	McMahon	White
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Willis
Fulbright	Mead	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CHAVEZ obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asks permission to state that there are some reports on the desk, together with some nominations from the President, and some morning business on the Secretary's desk. If there be no objection, these matters will be laid down, appropriately referred, and noted in the RECORD.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

In his capacity as a Senator, the Chair asks unanimous consent, as in executive session, to have laid before the Senate for appropriate reference certain nominations.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill which is in the form of a substitute for a bill previously introduced by me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for that purpose?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. As I understand, it can be done only by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. OVERTON. I have no objection.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill providing for the registration of firearms, and for other purposes, which is a substitute for Senate bill 1678, which I introduced a few days ago. The substitute bill has amendments which meet conditions which were not foreseen. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, to replace Senate bill 1678.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1755) providing for the registration of firearms, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1405) to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. DREWRY, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### RELIEF FOR THE DESTITUTE PEOPLE OF GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition signed by 34 Senators, addressed to the President of the United States, requesting that he facilitate the matter of feeding the destitute people of Germany and Austria.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned Members of the United States Senate, hereby appeal to you as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces to take immediate steps toward relieving the appalling famine in Germany and Austria.

The people of these countries are today facing starvation on a scale never before experienced in western civilization. War has destroyed most of their houses and factories. Millions of their men are dead. Many millions more are working as forced labor in foreign lands, thus unable to give aid to their wives and children. Millions of totally destitute deportees are milling aimlessly about the country. These people desperately need food, clothes, fuel, medicine, and shelter. The most appalling situation exists in the Russian zone due to the almost total loss of crops and livestock.

War has utterly destroyed Germany's war-making power. Surveillance and control are sufficient to ensure our future safety. We did not fight the war to exterminate the German people, but to destroy forever the

criminal Nazi leadership and their war machine.

Now the war is over. The German people must be offered the opportunity to work their way back into the community of nations. The American people do not want to be responsible for having permitted a catastrophe which cannot but drag all Europe into ruin and chaos. We in the United States have granaries overflowing with wheat. If properly used, our surpluses are sufficient to keep alive all needy people in the lands of our allies as well as our former enemies.

We, therefore, appeal to you, Mr. President:

1. To give orders at once to our armed forces in Germany and Austria to raise food rations above the present starvation level in the United States zone of occupation and restore immediately mail and postage service.

2. To start negotiations at once with the head of the Russian State with the object of gaining his permission to send American food supplies into the Russian zone of occupation in order at least to diminish the appalling daily death toll.

3. To give permission now to private relief organizations to start operations in Germany and Austria, in order to support the efforts of our occupation forces.

4. And, Mr. President, because we believe that the conditions in Germany and Austria are so desperate that even the above steps if taken immediately will not suffice, we further appeal to you to authorize and create an independent American relief mission to avert this impending disaster of wholesale starvation and pestilence now threatening Europe, even beyond the assistance now being furnished by UNRRA.

STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire; C. DOUGLASS BUCK, Republican, Delaware; HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Republican, South Dakota; HUGH BUTLER, Republican, Nebraska; HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana; ARTHUR CAPPER, Republican, Kansas; E. P. CARVILLE, Democrat, Nevada; SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Democrat, California; JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, Mississippi; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana; JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania; ALBERT HAWKES, Republican, New Jersey; B. B. HICKENLOOPER, Republican, Iowa; CLYDE R. HOEY, Democrat, North Carolina; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado; ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., Progressive, Wisconsin; WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota; E. H. MOORE, Republican, Oklahoma; ABE MURDOCK, Democrat, Utah; JAMES MURRAY, Democrat, Montana; JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming; GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, Democrat, Maryland; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, Massachusetts; HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Republican, Minnesota; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, New Jersey; W. A. STANFILL, Republican, Kentucky; GLEN H. TAYLOR, Democrat, Idaho; CHARLES W. TOBEY, Republican, New Hampshire; DAVID I. WALSH, Democrat, Massachusetts; BURTON K. WHEELER, Democrat, Montana; KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, Nebraska; ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin; RAYMOND E. WILLIS, Republican, Indiana; MILTON R. YOUNG, Republican, North Dakota.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE ERVIN, OF NORTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 476) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSEPH W. ERVIN, a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

*Resolved*, That is a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. HOEY] and myself I submit the resolution which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 217) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSEPH W. ERVIN, late a Representative from the State of North Carolina.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 21, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for the world's purest Teacher, who hast revealed unto us the peerless depths of eternal truth; who hast given us the will to believe, the will to live, and the will to work. Enable us to pursue these realities with the reasoned conviction that all men have the high privilege of enjoying these blessings.

Create within us a passion to preserve the glorious freedoms on which our Republic was founded. Reveal Thyself in the wondrous mercies of our homeland, and inspire us to labor for the perpetuity of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In quietness and meditation, help us to do the right and deal justly with all men, filled with perfect trust and freedom of spirit. O control and sustain us as we dedicate ourselves to those rights with which we have been endowed. Blessed is he who can go through the thunder of life's battle and keep spotless the garment of his character. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2348) entitled "An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3603) entitled "An act to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. HART to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1405) entitled "An act to authorize the President to retire certain officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. TOBEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Interior.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of War.
6. Alien Property Custodian.
7. Federal Security Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. National Housing Agency.
10. Office of Price Administration.
11. Selective Service System.
12. The Panama Canal.
13. United States Maritime Commission.
14. United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.
15. United States Railroad Retirement Board.
16. War Shipping Administration.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter addressed by him to the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, protesting against the ceiling price on cotton, and his reply.

Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include excerpts,

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who has a special order for 15 minutes today, may be permitted to proceed for an additional 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENGLAND GENERAL HOSPITAL, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I addressed the House calling attention to an article which had appeared in the Washington Daily News stating that the England General Hospital, now located in one of the hotel buildings at Atlantic City, where a number of seriously disabled veterans have been cared for, was going to be closed. I quoted the article, which stated that pressure had been brought to bear on the Army to do this. I stated in my remarks that I earnestly hoped the report was not true, and that any attempt to get disabled veterans moved out of a community would be reprehensible in any community where it took place, in my own district or anywhere else. In the 3 days that have followed, I have received a large number of letters from people living in Atlantic City, including the mayor of the city, assuring me of their desire to have the veterans' hospital continued. This is most encouraging and is just what I would have expected from the people of an American community.

On yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey in whose district Atlantic City is located addressed the House and took exception to my remarks, or, more exactly, to the newspaper article I quoted. May I point out that the whole purpose of my speech was to try to prevent removal of these disabled veterans from their present location, which they like so much. The response to my remarks from that point of view has been all on the positive side. The fact remains, however, that the order for closing the hospital has apparently been issued and still stands. I hope it will be rescinded. I have a letter here from some of the veterans located there protesting very much against it, and I shall include it in my remarks, since it may shed some light on the whole matter. In every community in this whole country, including Atlantic City, the majority of the people stand ready to do whatever they can for the disabled veteran. But in every community I am afraid there are a few who take a different attitude. And in the instant case I find the Washington News stating today that they have verified their original story and that pressure was brought to bear upon the War De-